The presentation outlines the work in progress dealing with the description and analysis of the main types of morphosyntactic, discourse-pragmatic and propositional-semantic features of complex clauses, particularly constructions with non-finite Adv- and Rel-clauses in Eastern Khanty – a Finno-Ugric language of indigenous hunter-gatherer communities of north-western Siberia totaling under 500 speakers. The empirical base of the study is a corpus of Eastern Khanty natural narratives both collected originally and published previously.

Selected methodology includes contrastive morpho-syntactic and contextual analysis of the narratives [1; 2; 3], employing the information structure analysis [4], pragmatic centering framework [5], in the general functional-typological framework.

Eastern Khanty non-finite constructions of interest are participial Adv-clauses (1, 3, 4, 5), shown in contrast to Rel-clauses (2), both predominantly pre-posed in the SOV Eastern Khanty [6], and traditionally analyzed as subordinate clauses displaying the typologically universal types of binding [2, 3]: i) intonation integration under a single intonation contour with the main clause; ii) relational government by the main-clause’s Su or O; and iii) reduced finiteness, in terms of pronominal agreement and TAM of the verb, or case-marking and determiners on the subject or object. Concurrently, these constructions display a continuum of diverse morphosyntactic means (1 vs. 3, vs. 4 and 5), which are taken to illustrate the non-discreteness, gradience of such features as finiteness, dependence, control, coherence, and pragmatic salience, with an overarching iconic principle recurrent throughout the cognitive-functional paradigm [7; 4; 8], i.e. there is a strong iconic correlation of increasing morphosyntactic expression to decreasing informational predictability/relevance. Based on the monostratal analysis of the host of the interrelated discourse-pragmatic, semantic and grammatical features of the participants in their interaction, it is affirmed, that discourse coherence always has some grammatical consequences. A wide cognitive faculty, structuring the information, specifies semantic and grammatical roles [9] and interrelation of the participants, governing the choice of morphosyntactic shape of referring expressions.

Data:

(1) puran pɛr̩ ħ got-m-am-n’ n’ayt-’m, otl’y pil
skidoo back-LAT tread-PP-1SG-LOC laugh-1SG yard ILL
lag-m-am-a imat sar-nam n’ax-ta j’x-’m
enter-PP-1SG-LAT more ahead-LAT laugh-INF become-1SG

‘Running behind the skidoo, I was laughing, and once in the front yard, I laughed even more’
(2) mä on ʔt́ ʔ-t́ qat-pa m-ʔ-táti ʔnt́ koj-l-ˈm
1SG learn-IMPP house-ALL go-INF NEG want-PRST-1SG
‘I do not want to go to school (learning house)’

(3) qunt́ qat tővy-ʰi i-m-ʰ, rätf uwˈyt tˈ…
when house fire-LOC eat-PP-3SG oldman see-PST0-3SG
‘When the house burnt down, the old man saw…’

(4) pötʃkä-li-m näl-ˈ pon-ˈm wʔjʔ joy ju-s-ˈm
gun-DIMN-POSS.1SG bullet-INSTR load-PP quietly home come-PST2-1SG
‘The gun loaded with a bullet, I got home little by little’

(5) torˈm-na qurt-ˈm ot-ˈt pajlaŋ wajay-qa j-ˈy-ˈt
sky-LOC scare-PP thing-PL with.wings animal-TRANSL become-EP-3PL
‘Kids, scared in the skies, turned into birds’

Abbreviations: 0/1/2/3 = person, Adv = adverbial (clause), ALL= allative, EP = epenthetic, ILL = illative, IMPP = imperfective participle, INF = infinitive, INSTR = instrumental, LAT = lative, LOC = locative, NEG = negation, PL = plural, PP = postposition, PRST = present, PST = past, Rel = relative (clause), SG = singular, SOV = subject + object + predicate TRANSL = translative, TAM = tense, aspect, mood.
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